

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

June 2, 1997

LB 23

have a right to do in America. But when we put it into the statutes, put outright falsehoods, then I believe we who take this process seriously should do something to try to rectify that. So my motion, which is to return this bill, would be to get rid of some of this inappropriate language in Section 1. But, if we were to take my amendment, all it would really do is strike this section from the bill, it would not strike it from the statute. Maybe. My...I know my time is running, but I have to check something, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask Senator Maurstad a question.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Maurstad, would...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Oh. Is he anywhere?

SPEAKER WITHEM: ...you be willing to respond to a question from Senator Chambers?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Maurstad, if in Section 1 there was nothing of great consequence, would you still be unwilling to have it stricken?

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Well, if I understand your motion, your motion isn't to go back and change anything. Your motion is to strike all the intent language, and in essence do away with Section 1. And I guess at this point...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, it wouldn't strike it from the law, it would strike it from this bill, because it didn't say strike and show as stricken. So what it would do is strike Section 1 because the only thing in it is "and Section 3 of this act", and I don't believe that anybody could read Section 3 and get the impression that that's legislative endorsement of abortion.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Senator, I'd have to visit with chairman of the Judiciary Committee to determine...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: ...whether or not that causes some problem